

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/685,875 | 10/14/2003 | David Kisenwether | DK-03-001 5799 | |
| 26134 | 7590 06/07/2005 | | EXAM | INER |
| RICHARD L. BIGELOW | | | ROSENBAUM, MARK | |
| 203 TREMONT STREET NEWINGTON, CT 06111 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3725 | 3725 |

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 10/685,875 | KISENWETHER, DAVID | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Mark Rosenbaum | 3725 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | _• | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This | a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowan | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner | , | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 5) | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | |

Art Unit: 3725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There is no proper antecedent basis for 'the surface' in claim 1, line 12, claim 10, line 13, and claim 12, line 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 11,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patterson. This patent discloses a shredder in figure 2 having a set of conveyors to shred a large amount of material at one time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3725

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger et al in view of Patterson. Krueger et al discloses the basic shredder including a single conveyor feeding material to a shrouded shredder. Only small amounts of material can be shredder simultaneously in the patent. Patterson solves this problem by disclosing similar apparatus including the use of side by side conveyors feeding material to a shredder. In order to more efficiently shred material, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Krueger et al by using a larger conveying system to deliver more material to the shredder for simultaneous shredding, taught to be desirable by Patterson. The remaining limitations would then have been obvious design choices only. For example, using conveyors 84 to 02 inches wide would have been obvious once it was known to use side by side conveyors as in Patterson.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Rosenbaum whose telephone number is 571-272-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Mårk Rosenbaum Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725

MR